arXiv:0908.4502v1 [math.AG] 31 Aug 2009

SESHADRI CONSTANTS ON RATIONAL SURFACES WITH ANTICANONICAL PENCILS

TARO SANO

Abstract. We provide an explicit formula for Seshadri constants of any polarizations on rational surfaces X such that $\dim |-K_X| \geq 1$. As an application, we discuss relationship between singularities of log del Pezzo surfaces and Seshadri constants of their anticanonical divisors. We also give some remarks on higher order embeddings of del Pezzo surfaces.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider projective varieties over an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{K}$ throughout this note.

The following criterion for ampleness is called Seshadri's criterion ([12] Theorem 1.4.13.).

Fact 1.1. *Let X be a projective variety and L a line bundle on X. Then L is ample if and only if there exists a positive number $\epsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\frac{L \cdot C}{\mathrm{mult}_x(C)} \geq \epsilon$$

for every point $x \in X$ and every irreducible curve $C \subset X$ passing through x.

This criterion leads us to define the following invariants for ample line bundles which are called Seshadri constants.

Definition 1.2. Let X be a projective variety, L be an ample line bundle on X and take $x \in X$. We define the Seshadri constant of L at x to be

$$\epsilon(L,x) := \inf_{x \in C} \left\{ \frac{L \cdot C}{\mathrm{mult}_x(C)}; C \subset X \text{ is a reduced irreducible curve through } x \right\}.$$

Remark 1.3. It is well-known that $\epsilon(L,x) = \max\{s \in \mathbb{R}; \mu_x^*(L) - sE_x \text{ is nef}\}$ where $\mu_x : \widetilde{X}(x) \to X$ is the blow-up at x and $E_x := \mu_x^{-1}(x)$ is the exceptional divisor .

Remark 1.4. We have $\epsilon(kL,x) = k\epsilon(L,x) (\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0})$. Since $\epsilon(L,x)$ depends only on the numerical class of L, we can define $\epsilon(L,x)$ for a nef $\mathbb{R}$-divisor L.

Remark 1.5. Put $\epsilon_{\min}(L) := \inf_{x \in X} \epsilon(L,x)$, then $\epsilon_{\min}(L) > 0$ by Proposition 1.1.

Let ϵ_L be the Seshadri function for L

$$\epsilon_L : X \to \mathbb{R}; x \mapsto \epsilon(L,x).$$

Then, ϵ_L takes constant value at a very general point x. We write this value $\epsilon_{\mathrm{gen}}(L)$.

Seshadri constants are called local positivity of ample line bundles on projective varieties. It was defined by Demailly [7] in the beginning of 90's in order to study generation of jets of line bundles. For example, Seshadri constants measure k-jet ampleness of ample line bundles. See the last section for detail.

Unfortunately, Seshadri constants are hard to compute, even for surfaces. There are many papers on explicit computations of Seshadri constants, for example, [1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9]. In this note, we give an explicit formula for Seshadri constants on rational surfaces X with $\dim|-K_X| \geq 1$ (Theorem 1.6) .

Seshadri constants sometimes have interesting geometric consequences. Nakamaye [13] established the fascinating result about Seshadri constants on abelian varieties which asserts that, if an abelian variety X posseses an ample line bundle L whose Seshadri constant is 1, then this abelian variety splits into a product of an elliptic curve and a $(\dim X - 1)$-dimensional abelian variety.

We try to get such a result in the case of log del Pezzo surfaces. As an application of our explicit formula, we get a consequence by which we can get information of singularities of log del Pezzo surfaces through Seshadri constants of their anticanonical divisors. Here, log del Pezzo surfaces are normal projective surfaces with only quotient singularities with ample anticanonical bundles.

1.1. The statement of the explicit formula.

First, we give an explicit formula for Seshadri constants of arbitrary ample line bundles on rational surfaces X such that $\dim|-K_X| \geq 1$. Since X is a rational surface, there is a composition of one-point blow-ups

$$X = X_{r+1} \to X_r \to \cdots \to X_2 \to X_1 = \mathbb{F}_n$$

for some integers $r, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Here we put $\mathbb{F}_0 := \mathbb{P}^2$ and $\mathbb{F}_n$ is the n-th hirzebruch surface. We treat three cases.

1. $n = 0, 1$, i.e. X is a blow-up of $\mathbb{P}^2$.
2. $n \geq 2$ and $r \geq n-1$.
3. $n \geq 2$ and $r \leq n-2$.

In this subsection, we state the formula in the case (1). The case (2) reduces to the case (1) and the case (3) is easy. We explain this in Section 3.3.

Let $\mu : X \to \mathbb{P}^2$ be a composition of blow-ups

$$\mu : X = X_{r+1} \overset{\mu_r}{\to} X_r \to \cdots \overset{\mu_1}{\to} X_1 = \mathbb{P}^2 \tag{1}$$

where $\mu_i : X_{i+1} \to X_i$ is the blow-up at $x_i \in X_i$. Now, we assume that

$$h^0(X, -K_X) \geq 2.$$

This is satisfied if $r \leq 8$ or if X is a rational elliptic surface with a section, for example. Note that $|-K_{\widetilde{X}(x)}| \neq \emptyset$. Let

$$L := \mu^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(a) - \sum_{i=1}^{r} b_i E_i$$

be an ample divisor on X where $E_i := \nu_i^{-1}(x_i) (i = 1, \ldots, r)$ are the exceptional divisors and $\nu_i := \mu_i \circ \cdots \circ \mu_r$. We assume that L is primitive, i.e. there is no integer

$c \geq 2$ such that $c|a, c|b_1, \ldots, c|b_r$. For $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, put

$$\Phi_s := \left\{ (\alpha; \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_s) \in \mathbb{Z}^{s+1}; \alpha^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{s} \beta_i^2 = -1, 3\alpha - \sum_{i=1}^{s} \beta_i = 1, \beta_s \geq 1 \right\},$$

$$\Psi_s := \left\{ (\alpha; \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_s) \in \mathbb{Z}^{s+1}; \alpha^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{s} \beta_i^2 = -2, 3\alpha - \sum_{i=1}^{s} \beta_i = 0, \beta_s \geq 1 \right\}.$$

Put

$$Z := \begin{cases} \{x \in X; \exists C \in |-K_X|, C : \text{irreducible}, \mathrm{Sing}(C) = \{x\}\} & (r = 8, 9) \\ \emptyset & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases},$$

and, for $(\alpha; \beta) = (\alpha; \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{r+1}) \in \Psi_{r+1}$, put

$$\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{X}(x)}(\alpha; \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{r+1}) := \mu_x^*(\mu^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\alpha) - \sum_{i=1}^{r} \beta_i E_i) - \beta_{r+1} E_x,$$

$$\Delta_{(\alpha;\beta)} := \begin{cases} \left\{ x \in X; \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{X}(x)}(\alpha; \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{r+1})|_\Theta \simeq \mathcal{O}_\Theta(\forall \Theta \in |-K_{\widetilde{X}(x)}|) \right\} & (\beta_{r+1} \geq 2) \\ E(\alpha; \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r) \in |\mu^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\alpha) - \sum_{i=1}^{r} \beta_i E_i| & \begin{pmatrix} \beta_{r+1} = 1, \\ \exists E(\alpha; \beta) : \text{irreducible} \end{pmatrix} \\ \emptyset & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

Put

$$b_{r+1} := \sqrt{a^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{r} b_i^2}, \overrightarrow{a} := (a; b_1, \ldots, b_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^{r+1}.$$

Here is the explicit formula for $\epsilon(L, x)$.

Theorem 1.6. *There are positive numbers $M_{\overrightarrow{a}}, N_{\overrightarrow{a}}$ which are determined by $\overrightarrow{a}$ (See Remark 3.5 for the definition of $M_{\overrightarrow{a}}, N_{\overrightarrow{a}}$) such that;*

(1) *If $r = 8, 9$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} < 3$, then*

$$\epsilon(L, x) = \begin{cases} \min\{A_{M_{\overrightarrow{a}}}(\overrightarrow{a}), B_{N_{\overrightarrow{a}}, x}(\overrightarrow{a}), C_x(\overrightarrow{a}), 3a - \sum_{i=1}^{r} b_i\} & (x \notin Z) \\ \min\{A_{M_{\overrightarrow{a}}}(\overrightarrow{a}), \frac{3a - \sum_{i=1}^{r} b_i}{2}\} & (x \in Z) \end{cases}$$

(2) *If $r = 8, 9$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} \geq 3$, then*

$$\epsilon(L, x) = \begin{cases} \min\{B_{N_{\overrightarrow{a}}, x}(\overrightarrow{a}), C_x(\overrightarrow{a}), 3a - \sum_{i=1}^{r} b_i\} & (x \notin Z) \\ \frac{3a - \sum_{i=1}^{r} b_i}{2} & (x \in Z) \end{cases}$$

(3) *Otherwise,*

$$\epsilon(L, x) = \min\{A_{M_{\overrightarrow{a}}}(\overrightarrow{a}), B_{N_{\overrightarrow{a}}, x}(\overrightarrow{a}), C_x(\overrightarrow{a})\}.$$

For $M > 0$, we put

$$A_M(\overrightarrow{a}) := \min_{(\alpha;\beta) \in \Phi_{r+1}, \alpha \leq M} \frac{\alpha a - \sum_{i=1}^{r} \beta_i b_i}{\beta_{r+1}},$$

$$B_{M,x}(\overrightarrow{a}) := \min_{(\alpha;\beta) \in \Psi_{r+1}(x), \alpha \leq M} \frac{\alpha a - \sum_{i=1}^{r} \beta_i b_i}{\beta_{r+1}},$$

$$C_x(\overrightarrow{a}) := \min_{(\alpha;\beta) \in \Pi_r(x)} \alpha a - \sum_{i=1}^{r} \beta_i b_i$$

where

$$\Psi_{r+1}(x) := \{(\alpha;\beta) \in \Psi_{r+1}; x \in \Delta_{(\alpha;\beta)}\},$$

$$\Pi_r(x) := \{(\alpha;\beta_1,\dots,\beta_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^{r+1}; \exists C \in \left|\mu^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\alpha) - \sum_{i=1}^{r} \beta_i E_i\right|, \\ x \in C : (-m)\text{-}curve (m \geq 2)\}.\square$$

Remark 1.7. Note that, for $M > 0$, we can see that $\Phi_{r+1}(M) := \{(\alpha;\beta) \in \Phi_{r+1}; \alpha \leq M\}$ and $\Psi_{r+1}(x,M) := \{(\alpha;\beta) \in \Psi_{r+1}(x); \alpha \leq M\}$ are finite sets. $\Pi_r(x)$ is also a finite set because $\widetilde{C} := (\mu_x^{-1})_*(C)$ is a fixed component of $|-K_{\widetilde{X}(x)}|$. So we can compute each minimum theoretically, at least.

Remark 1.8. Let W_s be the subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Z}^{s+1})$ generated by the elements

$$(x;y_1,\dots,y_s) \mapsto (x;y_{\sigma(1)},\dots,y_{\sigma(s)})(\sigma \in S_s = \text{the s-th symmetric group}),$$

$$(x;y_1,\dots,y_s) \mapsto (2x-y_1-y_2-y_3; x-y_2-y_3, x-y_1-y_3, x-y_1-y_2, y_4,\dots,y_s).$$

Then we have

$$\Phi_s = \{(\alpha;\beta_1,\dots,\beta_s) \in W_s(0;-1,0,\dots,0); \beta_s \geq 1\},$$
$$\Psi_s = \{(\alpha;\beta_1,\dots,\beta_s) \in W_s(0;-1,1,0,\dots,0); \beta_s \geq 1\}.$$

1.2. The consequence of the formula.

The following is the consequence of Theorem 1.6

Theorem 1.9. (1) *Let X be a log del Pezzo surface such that $K_X^2 = 9$. Then, the following are equivalent;*
  (a) $\epsilon_{\mathrm{gen}}(-K_X) = 3$.
  (b) $X \simeq \mathbb{P}^2$.
(2) *Let X be a log del Pezzo surface such that $K_X^2 = 4,5,6,7,8$. Then, the following are equivalent;*
  (a) $\epsilon_{\mathrm{gen}}(-K_X) = 2$.
  (b) *X has only canonical singularities or $X \simeq Z(k_1,\dots,k_m)$ where $(k_1,\dots,k_m) = (1,1,1,1,1), (2,1,1,1), (3,1,1), (2,2,1), (3,2), (4,1), or (5)$. See Section 4 for the definition.*

We also give some remark on higher order embeddings of del Pezzo surfaces in Section 5.

Acknowledgment. The author is grateful to his advisor Professor Yujiro Kawamata for his warm encouragement and valuable comments. The author would like to thank Professor Sandra Di Rocco for valuable suggestions on Section 5. The author is supported by the Global COE program of the University of Tokyo.

2. NOTATIONS

Let X be a smooth projective surface. Put $N^1(X) := (\mathrm{Pic}(X) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}) / \equiv$ where $\equiv$ means numerical equivalence. Let $\overline{NE}(X) \subset N^1(X)$ be the closure of the convex cone generated by classes of effective curves and $\mathrm{Nef}(X) \subset N^1(X)$ be the convex cone generated by classes of nef divisors. For $D \in \mathrm{Pic}\, X$, let $[D] \in N^1(X)$ be its numerical class. $D \in \mathrm{Pic}(X)$ is called $(-m)$-class if $D^2 = -m, K_X \cdot D = m-2$ where K_X is the canonical divisor of X. $(-m)$-class D is called $(-m)$-*cycle* (resp. $(-m)$-*curve*) if it is represented by an effective divisor (resp. an irreducible divisor).

3. PROOF OF THE FORMULA

3.1. **Preparation.** First, the following fact about the effective cones of anticanonical rational surfaces is fundamental for us.

Fact 3.1. [11] *Let X be an anticanonical rational surface, i.e. $|-K_X| \neq \emptyset$. Then,*

$$\overline{NE}(X) = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}[-K_X] + \sum_{\substack{C \subset X: \textit{irreducible curve}, \\ C^2 < 0}} \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}[C].$$

The next proposition reveals the type of negative curves on anticanonical rational surfaces.

Lemma 3.2. *Let X be an anticanonical rational surface and $C \subset X$ be an irreducible curve such that $C^2 < 0$. Then C is a (-1)-curve, a (-2)-curve or a fixed component of $|-K_X|$*

Proof. Suppose C is not a fixed component of $|-K_X|$. Then, $-K_X \cdot C \geq 0$ and so $2p_a(C) - 2 = (K_X + C) \cdot C \leq C^2 < 0$ where $p_a(C)$ is the arithmetic genus of C. Therefore we get $C \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$ and $C^2 = -1, -2$. □

Let X be an anticanonical rational surface. By Fact 3.1 and Lemma 3.2, since (-1)-class is always effective, we have

$$\operatorname{Nef}(X) = P_{-K_X} \cap \left(\bigcap_{E:(-1)\text{-class}} P_E \right) \cap \left(\bigcap_{E:(-2)\text{-cycle}} P_E \right) \cap \left(\bigcap_{E \subset \operatorname{Fix}|-K_X|} P_E \right). \tag{2}$$

where, for $D \in \operatorname{Pic} X$, we put $P_D := \{\alpha \in N^1(X); [D] \cdot \alpha \geq 0\}$ and $\operatorname{Fix}|-K_X|$ is the fixed part of $|-K_X|$.

Recall that $\epsilon(L, x) = \max\{s \in \mathbb{R}; \mu_x^* L - sE_x : \text{nef}\}$. By the equality (2), there exists $D' \in \operatorname{Pic} \widetilde{X}(x)$ such that $(\mu_x^* L - \epsilon(L, x)E_x) \cdot D' = 0$ where D' is a (-1)-class, a (-2)-cycle or a fixed component of $|-K_X|$.

Therefore we have

$$\epsilon(L, x) = \min\{A(L), B_x(L), C'_x(L), -K_X \cdot L\} \tag{3}$$

where

$$A(L) := \inf\left\{ \frac{L \cdot D}{\beta_{r+1}}; \beta_{r+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}, \mu_x^* D - \beta_{r+1} E_x : (-1)\text{-class} \right\},$$

$$B_x(L) := \inf\{ \frac{L \cdot D}{\beta_{r+1}}; \beta_{r+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}, \mu_x^* D - \beta_{r+1} E_x : (-2)\text{-class}, x \in \Delta_{D, \beta_{r+1}} \},$$

$$C'_x(L) := \min\{L \cdot D; x \in D, \widetilde{D} = (\mu_x^{-1})_* D \subset \operatorname{Fix}|-K_{\widetilde{X}(x)}|\}$$

where, for $D \in \operatorname{Pic} X$ and $\beta_{r+1} \geq 1$ such that $\mu_x^* D - \beta_{r+1} E_x$ is a (-2)-class, we put

$$\Delta_{D, \beta_{r+1}} := \begin{cases} \left\{ x \in X; (\mu_x^* D - \beta_{r+1} E_x)|_\Theta \simeq \mathcal{O}_\Theta (\forall \Theta \in |-K_{\widetilde{X}(x)}|) \right\} & (\beta_{r+1} \geq 2) \\ E_D \in |D| & \begin{pmatrix} \beta_{r+1} = 1, \\ \exists E_D : \text{irreducible} \end{pmatrix} \\ \emptyset & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

We can use $B_x(L)$ because, for $D \in \operatorname{Pic} X$ and $\beta_{r+1} \geq 2$ such that the linear system $|\mu_x^* D - \beta_{r+1} E_x|$ contains a (-2)-curve, we can see that $(\mu_x^* D - \beta_{r+1} E_x)|_\Theta \simeq \mathcal{O}_\Theta$ for $\Theta \in |-K_{\widetilde{X}(x)}|$.

Definition 3.3. We say that $D' \in \operatorname{Pic} \widetilde{X}(x)$ is L-computing if $(\mu_x^* L - \epsilon(L,x) E_x) \cdot D' = 0$ and $D' \cdot E_x \geq 1$.
We say that $D' \in \operatorname{Pic} \widetilde{X}(x)$ is L-*candidate* (resp. L-*exceptional*) if $\left(\mu_x^* L - \sqrt{L^2} E_x\right) \cdot D' \leq 0$ (resp. < 0) and $D' \cdot E_x \geq 1$.

Note that L-computing class is L-candidate because $\epsilon(L,x) \leq \sqrt{L^2}$. Therefore, for a fixed L, it is enough to consider the L-candidate classes. In general, there are infinitely many (-1)-classes or (-2)-classes on $\widetilde{X}(x)$. But, Lemma 3.4 shows that it is enough for computing $\epsilon(L,x)$ to consider finitely many L-candidate (-1)-classes and (-2)-classes.

3.2. The case when X is a blow-up of $\mathbb{P}^2$.

Let X be a blown-up $\mathbb{P}^2$ as in Section 1.1.. For $(\alpha; \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{r+1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{r+2}$, put

$$\mathcal{O}(\alpha; \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{r+1}) := \mu_x^* \left(\mu^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\alpha) - \sum_{i=1}^{r} \beta_i E_i \right) - \beta_{r+1} E_x.$$

Lemma 3.4.

1. *If* $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} \neq 3$ *and* $\mathcal{O}(\alpha; \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{r+1})$ *is a* L-*candidate* (-1)-*class, then* $\alpha \leq M_{\overrightarrow{a}}$ *where* $M_{\overrightarrow{a}}$ *is the number defined in Remark 3.5.*
2. *If* $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} = 3$ *and* $\mathcal{O}(\alpha; \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{r+1})$ *is a* L-*exceptional* (-1)-*class, then* $\alpha \leq M_{\overrightarrow{a}}$ *where* $M_{\overrightarrow{a}}$ *is the number defined in Remark 3.5.*
3. *If* $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} \neq 3$ *and* $\mathcal{O}(\alpha; \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{r+1})$ *is a* L-*candidate* (-2)-*class, then* $\alpha \leq N_{\overrightarrow{a}}$ *where* $N_{\overrightarrow{a}}$ *is the number defined in Remark 3.5.*
4. *If* $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} = 3$ *and* $\mathcal{O}(\alpha; \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{r+1})$ *is a* L-*exceptional* (-2)-*class, then* $\alpha \leq N_{\overrightarrow{a}}$ *where* $N_{\overrightarrow{a}}$ *is the number defined in Remark 3.5.*

Remark 3.5. $M_{\overrightarrow{a}} > 0$ is defined as follows;

1. If $r \leq 7$, then $M_{\overrightarrow{a}} = 6$.
2. If $r = 8, 9$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} < 3$, then $M_{\overrightarrow{a}}$ is the unique positive number such that
$$\frac{M_{\overrightarrow{a}} + 3 + \sqrt{(r-8)M_{\overrightarrow{a}}^2 + 6M_{\overrightarrow{a}} + r}}{M_{\overrightarrow{a}}^2 + 1} = 3 - \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a}.$$
3. If $r \geq 10$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} > 3$, then $M_{\overrightarrow{a}}$ is the unique positive number such that
$$\frac{\sqrt{(r-8)M_{\overrightarrow{a}}^2 + 6M_{\overrightarrow{a}} + r} - M_{\overrightarrow{a}} - 3}{M_{\overrightarrow{a}}^2 + 1} = \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} - 3.$$
4. If $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} = 3$, then $M_{\overrightarrow{a}}$ is the unique positive number such that
$$\sqrt{{M_{\overrightarrow{a}}}^2 + 1} + M_{\overrightarrow{a}} = a.$$

$N_{\overrightarrow{a}} > 0$ is defined as follows;

1. If $r \leq 7$, then $N_{\overrightarrow{a}} = 6$.

(2) If $r \geq 8$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} < 3$, then $N_{\overrightarrow{a}}$ is the unique positive number such that

$$\frac{6+\sqrt{2(r-8)N_{\overrightarrow{a}}^2+4(r+1)}}{N_{\overrightarrow{a}}^2+2} = 3 - \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a}.$$

(3) If $r \geq 9$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} > 3$, then $N_{\overrightarrow{a}}$ is the unique positive number such that

$$\frac{\sqrt{2(r-8)N_{\overrightarrow{a}}^2+4(r+1)}-6}{N_{\overrightarrow{a}}^2+2} = \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} - 3.$$

(4) If $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} = 3$, then $N_{\overrightarrow{a}}$ is the unique positive number such that

$$\frac{\sqrt{{N_{\overrightarrow{a}}}^2+2}+N_{\overrightarrow{a}}}{2} = a.$$

Proof. If $r \leq 7$, this lemma is trivial, because there are only finitely many (-1)-classes or (-2)-classes on $\widetilde{X}(x)$. So we assume $r \geq 8$.
Let us prepare notations first. For $(\alpha;\beta) = (\alpha;\beta_1,\dots,\beta_{r+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{r+2}$, put

$$\begin{aligned} S_{=1} &:= \{(y_1,\dots,y_{r+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{r+1}; y_1^2+\cdots+y_{r+1}^2 = 1\},\\ \mathrm{Neg}_{(\alpha;\beta)} &:= \{(y_1,\dots,y_{r+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{r+1}; \beta_1 y_1+\cdots+\beta_{r+1}y_{r+1} \geq \alpha\},\\ H_{(\alpha;\beta)} &:= \{(y_1,\dots,y_{r+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{r+1}; \beta_1 y_1+\cdots+\beta_{r+1}y_{r+1} = \alpha\},\\ S_{(\alpha;\beta)} &:= S_{=1} \cap H_{(\alpha;\beta)}, P_\alpha := \left(\frac{\alpha}{3\alpha-1},\dots,\frac{\alpha}{3\alpha-1}\right) = H_{(\alpha;\beta)} \cap (\mathbb{R}\cdot(1,\dots,1)). \end{aligned}$$

For $(\alpha;\beta) \in \Phi_{r+1}$, let $l_{(\alpha;\beta)} \subset \mathbb{R}^{r+1}$ be the line which passes through $O := (0,\dots,0) \in \mathbb{R}^{r+1}$ and satisfies $l_{(\alpha;\beta)} \perp H_{(\alpha;\beta)}$. Put $O_{(\alpha;\beta)} := \frac{\alpha}{\alpha^2+1}(\beta_1,\dots,\beta_{r+1}) = l_{(\alpha;\beta)} \cap H_{(\alpha;\beta)}$. Let $l'_{(\alpha;\beta)}$ be the line through P_α and $O_{(\alpha;\beta)}$. Note that $l_{(\alpha;\beta)} \perp l'_{(\alpha;\beta)}$. Let $P_1(\alpha;\beta), P_2(\alpha;\beta) \in \mathbb{R}^{r+1}$ be points such that $l'_{(\alpha;\beta)} \cap S_{=1} = \{P_1(\alpha;\beta), P_2(\alpha;\beta)\}$ where $P_1(\alpha;\beta) \in \mathrm{Neg}_{(3;1,\dots,1)}$ and $P_2(\alpha;\beta) \notin \mathrm{Neg}_{(3;1,\dots,1)}$.
(1) Now $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} \neq 3$ and let $\mathcal{O}(\alpha;\beta_1,\dots,\beta_{r+1})$ be an L-candidate class. Then $\alpha a - \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \beta_i b_i \geq 0$. Put $P(a;b) := (\frac{b_1}{a},\dots,\frac{b_{r+1}}{a}) \in \mathbb{R}^{r+1}$. For $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{r+1}$, let $d(z_1,z_2)$ be the distance between z_1 and z_2. By elementary computations, we can see that

$$\begin{aligned} d_1 &:= d(O_{(\alpha;\beta)}, H_{(3;1,\dots,1)}) = \frac{\alpha+3}{\sqrt{r+1}(\alpha^2+1)}, d_2 := d(O, O_{(\alpha;\beta)}) = \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\alpha^2+1}},\\ d_3 &:= d(O_{(\alpha;\beta)}, P_i(\alpha;\beta)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha^2+1}}(i=1,2), d_4 := d(O, P_\alpha) = \frac{\sqrt{r+1}\alpha}{3\alpha-1}\\ d_5 &:= d(O_{(\alpha;\beta)}, P_\alpha) = \frac{\alpha}{3\alpha-1}\sqrt{\frac{(r-8)\alpha^2+6\alpha+r}{\alpha^2+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

(Case 1) If $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} < 3$, then

$$d(P_2(\alpha;\beta), H_{(3;1,\dots,1)}) = d_3 \cdot \frac{d_5}{d_4} + d_1 = \frac{\alpha+3+\sqrt{(r-8)\alpha^2+6\alpha+r}}{\sqrt{r+1}(\alpha^2+1)}.$$

So, if $\alpha \geq M_{\overrightarrow{a}}$, then

$$d(P_2(\alpha;\beta), H_{(3;1,\dots,1)}) < d(P(a;b), H_{(3;1,\dots,1)}) = \frac{3 - \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a}}{\sqrt{r+1}}$$

and $P(a;b) \notin \mathrm{Neg}_{(\alpha;\beta)}$.
(Case 2) If $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} > 3$, then

$$d(P_1(\alpha;\beta), H_{(3;1,\dots,1)}) = d_3 \cdot \frac{d_5}{d_4} - d_1 = \frac{\sqrt{(r-8)\alpha^2 + 6\alpha + r} - \alpha - 3}{\sqrt{r+1}(\alpha^2+1)}.$$

So, if $\alpha \geq M_{\overrightarrow{a}}$, then $d(P_1(\alpha;\beta), H_{(\alpha;\beta)}) < d(P(a;b), H_{(3;1,\dots,1)})$ and $P(a;b) \notin \mathrm{Neg}_{(\alpha;\beta)}$.
(2) If $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} = 3$, then $P(a;b) \in \mathrm{Neg}_{(\alpha;\beta)}$ and moreover $P(a;b)$ lies between $H_{(\alpha;\beta)}$ and $H_{(\sqrt{\alpha^2+1};\beta)}$ because $H_{(\sqrt{\alpha^2+1};\beta)} \cap S_{=1} = \{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha^2+1}}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{r+1})\}$. So we have

$$0 < d(P(a;b), H_{(\alpha;\beta)}) \leq d(H_{(\alpha;\beta)}, H_{(\sqrt{\alpha^2+1};\beta)}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha^2+1}(\sqrt{\alpha^2+1}+\alpha)}.$$

And we have $d(P(a;b), H_{(\alpha;\beta)}) = \frac{|\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \beta_i b_i - \alpha a|}{a\sqrt{\alpha^2+1}} \geq \frac{1}{a\sqrt{\alpha^2+1}}$ because $b_i \in \mathbb{Z} (\forall i)$. Therefore $\sqrt{\alpha^2+1} + \alpha \leq a$ and we get the result.

(3),(4) are analogous to (1),(2).

□

Remark 3.6. Note that, in the case $r = 8, 9$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} \geq 3$, we can see that $A(L) \geq -K_X \cdot L$. So we don't need to define $M_{\overrightarrow{a}}$ in this case. Note also that, when $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} = 3$, either $-K_{\widetilde{X}(x)}$ or some L-exceptional class at x is L-computing at x.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. It is easy to see that $D' \subset \mathrm{Fix}\,|-K_{\widetilde{X}(x)}|$ such that $\mu_x(D')$ is not $(-m)$-curve, then $\mu_x(D') \in |-K_X|$ is irreducible and $\mathrm{mult}_x(\mu_x(D')) = 2$ and this happens only if X is the blow-up of $\mathbb{P}^2$ and $r = 8, 9$.

By this fact, the equality(3), Lemma 3.4, and Remark 3.6, we get Theorem 1.6. □

3.3. **The case when X is a blow-up of $\mathbb{F}_n$.** Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer and $\mu : X \to \mathbb{F}_n$ be a composition of blow-ups

$$\mu : X = X_{r+1} \overset{\mu_r}{\to} X_r \to \cdots \overset{\mu_1}{\to} X_1 = \mathbb{F}_n \tag{4}$$

where $\mu_i : X_{i+1} \to X_i$ is a blow-up at $x_i \in X_i$. Assume $\dim|-K_X| \geq 1$ as before. Put $\nu_i := \mu_i \circ \cdots \circ \mu_r$ and $E_i := \nu_i^{-1}(x_i)$. Let L be an ample line bundle on X as

$$L = \mu^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}_n}(ah + bf) - \sum_{i=1}^{r} c_i E_i$$

where h is the class of the minimal section of $\mathbb{F}_n$ and f is the fiber class.

First, consider the case $r \geq n-1$. Recall the equality(3). Since (-1)-classes are always effective, $A(L)$ can be computed by taking X such that $X_n \to X_1$ is a blow-up at $x_1, \dots, x_{n-1} \in \mathbb{F}_n$ which are not on the negative setion and are on distinct fibers $f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}$ respectively, and such that X has a birational morphism

$$\mu' : X = X'_{r+2} \overset{\mu'_{r+1}}{\to} X'_{r+1} \to \cdots \overset{\mu'_1}{\to} X'_1 = \mathbb{P}^2$$

where $\mu'_i : X'_{i+1} \to X'_i$ is the blow-up at $x'_i \in X'_i$ and $\mu_2 \circ \cdots \circ \mu_n : X_n = X'_{n+1} \to X'_2$ is the blow-up at distinct $(n-1)$-points on E'_1. Put $E'_i := (\mu'_i \circ \cdots \circ \mu'_{r+1})^{-1}(x'_i)$. $\mu^*h, \mu^*f, E_1, \dots, E_r$ can be written by $\mu'^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1), E'_1, \dots, E'_{r+1}$ as follows;

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu^*h = E'_1 - \sum_{i=2}^{n} E'_i, \mu^*f = \mu'^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1) - E'_1,\\
&E_1 = \mu'^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1) - E'_1 - E'_2, \dots, E_{n-1} = \mu'^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1) - E'_1 - E'_n,\\
&E_n = E'_{n+1}, \dots, E_r = E'_{r+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, L can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
L &= \mu'^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(b - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_i) - (-a + b - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_i)E'_1\\
&- (a - c_1)E'_2 - \cdots - (a - c_{n-1})E'_n - c_n E'_{n+1} - \cdots - c_r E'_{r+1}\\
&= \mathcal{O}(b - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_i; -a + b - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_i, a - c_1, \dots, a - c_{n-1}, c_n, \dots, c_r)
\end{aligned}$$

Put $\overrightarrow{a}' := (b - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_i; -a + b - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_i, a - c_1, \dots, a - c_{n-1}, c_n, \dots, c_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^{r+2}$. Then it is easy to see that

$$A(L) = A_{M_{\overrightarrow{a}'}}(\overrightarrow{a}'), B_x(L) = B_{N_{\overrightarrow{a}'}, x}(\overrightarrow{a}').$$

So, we can get the similar formula of $\epsilon(L, x)$ for this X as in the case of blown-up $\mathbb{P}^2$'s.

Next, consider the case $r \le n - 2$. In this case, L-candidate (-1)-class on $\widetilde{X}(x)$ is $\nu_x^* f - E_x$ where $\nu_x := \mu \circ \mu_x$ and $E_x := \mu_x^{-1}(x)$. And, for $m \ge 2$, L-candidate $(-m)$-classes on $\widetilde{X}(x)$ are the classes of the strict transform of $(-m+1)$-curves on X through x. Therefore,

$$\epsilon(L, x) = \min\{b, \min\{L \cdot E; E \subset X : \text{irreducible curve}, E^2 \le -1, x \in E\}\}.$$

Note that E in the second term is the strict transform of a fiber or the minimal section on $\mathbb{F}_n$ or the irreducible component of some E_i.

3.4. **Corollaries.** Let X be a blown-up $\mathbb{P}^2$ as in Section 1.1.

Corollary 3.7.

$$\epsilon_{\text{gen}}(L) = \begin{cases} 3a - \sum_{i=1}^{r} b_i & (r = 9, \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} \ge 3) \\ A_{M_{\overrightarrow{a}}}(\overrightarrow{a}) & (\textit{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

Proof. $\dim Z = 0$ is well known. For $\Theta \in |-K_X|$ and $(\alpha; \beta) \in \Psi_{r+1}$, we can see that $\Theta \cap \Delta_{(\alpha;\beta)}$ is a finite set. Therefore $\dim \Delta_{(\alpha;\beta)} \le 1$. And the union of all $(-m)$-curves ($\forall m \ge 1$) are not the whole X. So we get the result by Theorem 1.6. □

In particular, we get the following.

Corollary 3.8. *Let X be a rational surface such that $\dim |-K_X| \ge 1$ and $-K_X$ is nef. Put $r := 9 - K_X^2$. Then,*

$$\epsilon_{\text{gen}}(-K_X) = a_r$$

where a_r is the number defined in Remark 3.9.

Remark 3.9 ([6]). If $\mu : X = X_{r+1} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ is the blow-up at general r points, then

$$\epsilon_{\mathrm{gen}}(-K_X) = \begin{cases} 2 & (1 \leq r \leq 5) \\ \frac{3}{2} & (r = 6) \\ \frac{4}{3} & (r = 7) \\ 1 & (r = 8) \end{cases}$$

We put $a_r := \epsilon_{\mathrm{gen}}(-K_{X_{r+1}})(r = 1, \dots, 8)$.

Remark 3.10. Let X be a smooth projective variety and fix an ample line bundle L on X. Put

$$R_L := \{x \in X ; \epsilon(L, x) < \epsilon_{\mathrm{gen}}(L)\},$$

then R_L is a countable union of closed subsets. The following question seems interesting for me.

Problem 3.11. *Is there an ample line bundle L such that R_L is not Zariski closed?*

Let X be a blown-up $\mathbb{P}^2$ such that $\dim |-K_X| \geq 1$. Fix L. We have infinitely many closed sets $\Delta_{(\alpha;\beta)}$ where $\epsilon(L, x)$ may drop down. But, in fact, $\epsilon(L, x)$ drop down properly on finite of these. For L such that $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} \neq 3$, we see that $\{(\alpha;\beta) \in \Psi_{r+1}; P(a;b) \in \mathrm{Neg}_{(\alpha;\beta)}\}$ is a finite set by arguments similar to Lemma 3.4(1). For L such that $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \frac{b_i}{a} = 3$, we see that $\{(\alpha;\beta) \in \Psi_{r+1}; P(a;b) \in \mathrm{Neg}_{(\alpha;\beta)}\}$ is a finite set by arguments similar to Lemma 3.4(2). If there are infinitely many (-2)-curves on X, the same reasoning works. So, $D(L) := \{x \in X; \epsilon(L, x) < \epsilon_{\mathrm{gen}}(L)\}$ is a closed set.

4. Seshadri constants and singularities of log del Pezzo surfaces

Seshadri constants have lower semicontinuity with respect to deformation in the following sense.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $f : \mathcal{X} \to T$ be a flat projective morphism of algebraic varieties, $s : T \to \mathcal{X}$ be a section of f i.e. $f \circ s = id_T$ and $\mathcal{L}$ be a f-ample invertible sheaf on $\mathcal{X}$. Assume f is smooth along $s(T)$. Then,*

$$\epsilon_{\mathcal{L},s} : T_{ct} \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}; t \mapsto \epsilon(\mathcal{L}|_{f^{-1}(t)}, s(t))$$

is a lower semicontinuous function. Here $T_{ct} = T$ as a set and the topology of T_{ct} is determined by the rule that the closed subsets of T_{ct} are countable unions of Zariski closed subsets of T.

Now, let X be a log del Pezzo surface which has $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein smoothing i.e. there is a flat projective morphism $f : \mathcal{X} \to T \ni 0$ such that $-K_{\mathcal{X}/T}$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier, f-ample, $\mathcal{X}_0 \simeq X$, and $\mathcal{X}_t (t \neq 0)$ are smooth. Then, by Proposition 4.1, we have

$$\epsilon_{\mathrm{gen}}(-K_{\mathcal{X}_0}) \leq \epsilon_{\mathrm{gen}}(-K_{\mathcal{X}_t}).$$

The following question is the main subject of this section.

Problem 4.2. *Determine X such that equality holds in the above inequality.*

Remark 4.3. It is known that, for log del Pezzo surfaces X, X have $\mathbb{Q}$-Gorenstein smoothing if and only if X has only T-singularities, i.e. X has only Du Val singularities or cyclic quotient singularities of type $\frac{1}{dn^2}(1, dna - 1)$ for some $d, n, a \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $(a, n) = 1$. For detail, see [10].

We answer problem 4.2 when $4 \leq K_X^2 \leq 9$. In these cases, we don't need the assumption that X has only T-singularities.

Theorem 4.4. (1) *Let X be a log del Pezzo surface such that $K_X^2 = 9$. Then, the following are equivalent;*

  (a) $\epsilon_{\mathrm{gen}}(-K_X) = 3$.
  (b) $X \simeq \mathbb{P}^2$.

(2) *Let X be a log del Pezzo surface such that $K_X^2 = 4, 5, 6, 7, 8$. Then, the following are equivalent;*

  (a) $\epsilon_{\mathrm{gen}}(-K_X) = 2$.
  (b) *X has only canonical singularities or $X \simeq Z(k_1, \dots, k_m)$ where $(k_1, \dots, k_m) = (1,1,1,1,1), (2,1,1,1), (3,1,1), (2,2,1), (3,2), (4,1), or (5)$.*

$Z(k_1, \dots, k_m)$ is the log del Pezzo surface constructed as follows; Let $z_1, \dots, z_m \in l \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be the distinct points on a line l. Let

$$Y(k_1, \dots, k_m) = Y_6 \overset{\phi_5}{\to} Y_5 \to \cdots \overset{\phi_1}{\to} Y_1 = \mathbb{P}^2$$

be the composition of blow-ups ϕ_i at some $y_i \in Y_i$ which we define as follows. We can write $i = k_1 + \cdots + k_{m'} + k(i)$ for some $0 \leq m' \leq m-1$ and some $0 \leq k(i) \leq k_{m'+1}$. Then y_i is the strict transform of $z_{m'+1}$ if $k(i) = 1$, and $y_i = \widetilde{l} \cap \phi_{i-1}^{-1}(y_{i-1})$ otherwise. $Y(k_1, \dots, k_m) \to Z(k_1, \dots, k_m)$ is a contraction of a (-4)-curve and (-2)-curves.

Proof. Let $\nu : Y \to X$ be the minimal resolution of X. We can write

$$K_Y = \nu^* K_X - \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i F_i \quad (0 \leq \exists a_i < 1)$$

where $\nu^{-1}(\operatorname{Sing} X) = \bigcup_{i=1}^k F_i$ is the irreducible decomposition. Then $\epsilon_{\mathrm{gen}}(-K_X) = \epsilon_{\mathrm{gen}}(-K_Y - \sum_{i=1}^k a_i F_i) = \epsilon(-K_Y - \sum_{i=1}^k a_i F_i, y)$ where $y \in Y$ is in very general position.

Suppose X has only canonical singularities. Since $a_i = 0 (\forall i)$, we have $\epsilon_{\mathrm{gen}}(-K_X) = \epsilon_{\mathrm{gen}}(-K_Y) = 2$ by Corollary 3.8. Suppose $X = Z(k_1, \dots, k_m)$. We can compute $\epsilon_{\mathrm{gen}}(-K_X) = 2$ by Theorem 1.6. Thus (b) implies (a) both in (1),(2).

Suppose X has a non-canonical singularity. And suppose $K_X^2 = 4, 5, 6, 7, 8$.
Case1) Suppose Y has a birational morphism

$$\chi : Y = Y_{r+1} \overset{\rho_r}{\to} Y_r \overset{\rho_{r-1}}{\to} \cdots Y_2 \overset{\rho_1}{\to} Y_1 = \mathbb{P}^2$$

where ρ_i is the blow up at $y_i \in Y_i$ and we put $\chi_i := \rho_i \circ \cdots \circ \rho_r, E_i = \chi_i^{-1}(y_i)$.

Define $\alpha^{(j)}, \beta_i^{(j)} \in \mathbb{Z}$ by $F_j = \chi^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\alpha^{(j)}) - \sum_{i=1}^r \beta_i^{(j)} E_i$. Assume that there exists F_{j_0} such that $F_{j_0}^2 \leq -3$ and $\alpha^{(j_0)} \geq 2$, then $\alpha^{(j_0)} > \beta_i^{(j_0)} (\forall i)$. Let $l_1(y) \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be the line through $\chi(y), y_1 \in \mathbb{P}^2$ and $\widetilde{l_1(y)} \subset Y$ be its strict transform. Then, since $F_{j_0} \cdot \widetilde{l_1(y)} > 0$, $a_{j_0} > 0$ and $\widetilde{l_1(y)}$ is nef, we get

$$(-K_Y - \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i F_i) \cdot \widetilde{l_1(y)} = 2 - \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i F_i \cdot \widetilde{l_1(y)} < 2,$$

and so $\epsilon_{\mathrm{gen}}(-K_X) < 2$.

Next, assume that there exists F_{j_0} such that $F_{j_0}^2 \leq -3$ and $\alpha^{(j_0)} = 0$. We can assume that $y_1, \dots, y_s (s \leq r)$ are distinct points on $\mathbb{P}^2$ which are not infinitely near each other. Let $E'_i \subset Y$ be the strict transform of $\rho_i^{-1}(y_i)$. Then it can be shown that there exists F_{j_1} such that $a_{j_1} > 0, \alpha^{(j_1)} = 0$ and F_{j_1} is the strict transform of some $E'_{i_1}(1 \leq \exists i_1 \leq s)$. Put $l_{i_1}(y) \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be the line through y and y_{i_1} and $\widetilde{l_{i_1}(y)} \subset Y$ be its strict transform. Then, similarly as above, we get

$$(-K_Y - \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i F_i) \cdot \widetilde{l_{i_1}(y)} = 2 - \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i F_i \cdot \widetilde{l_{i_1}(y)} < 0,$$

and so $\epsilon_{\text{gen}}(-K_X) < 2$.

Finally, assume that all F_j such that $F_j^2 \leq -3$ satisfies $\alpha^{(j)} = 1$. If F_j satisfies $\beta_i^{(j)} = 1 (\forall i)$, then there is only one F_j such that $F_j^2 \leq -3$. We can assume $j = 1$. Then, $\alpha^{(j)} = 0 (\forall j \neq 1)$. In this case, $F_j^2 = -2, F_j \cdot F_0 = 0 (\forall j \neq 1)$. Then $F_1^2 = -4$ and $r = 5$ because $K_X^2 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore, we can see that Y is one of $Y(k_1, \ldots, k_m)$. If there is an i such that $\beta_i^{(j)} = 0$, then we can assume that E'_1 is one of the $F_{j'}(j' \neq j)$ and $a_{j'} > 0$. Then we can show $\epsilon_{\text{gen}}(-K_X) < 2$ by the similar method as above using $\widetilde{l_1(y)}$.

Case 2) Otherwise Y has a birational morphism $\chi : Y \to \mathbb{F}_n$ for some $n \geq 3$. We can assume that F_1 is the strict transform of the minimal section X_0 and so $a_1 > 0$. Then $\epsilon_{\text{gen}}(-K_Y - \sum a_i F_i) \leq (-K_Y - \sum a_i F_i) \cdot \mu^* f \leq 2 - a_1 \mu^* X_0 \cdot \mu^* f = 2 - a_1 < 2$ where $f \in \operatorname{Pic} \mathbb{F}_n$ is the class of a fiber of $\mathbb{F}_n \to \mathbb{P}^1$. Thus (a) implies (b) when $K_X^2 = 4, 5, 6, 7, 8$.

When $K_X^2 = 9$, it is easy to see that $\epsilon_{\text{gen}}(-K_X) < 3$. $\square$

Remark 4.5. Consider Problem 4.2 in the case $K_X^2 = 3$. There exists a log del Pezzo surface X such that $K_X^2 = 3$ and $\epsilon_{\text{gen}}(-K_X) > \frac{3}{2}$. This X has a non-T-singularity. So we can't give a proposition like Theorem 4.4 without an assumption of T-singularity when $K_X^2 = 3$. We found some log del Pezzo surfaces X with only T-singularities such that $K_X^2 = 3$ and $\epsilon_{\text{gen}}(-K_X) = \frac{3}{2}$. But we think there are few such X.

5. Higher order embeddings of del Pezzo surfaces

We start this section by reviewing notions of higher order embedding. Let X be a smooth projective variety, L be an ample divisor on X and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

Definition 5.1. L is said to be k-very ample if given any 0-dimensional subscheme $(Z, \mathcal{O}_Z)$ of X with $h^0(Z, \mathcal{O}_Z) = k + 1$, the restriction map $H^0(X, L) \to H^0(X, L \otimes \mathcal{O}_Z)$ is surjective.

Let $\mathcal{Z} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_r\}$ be a finite collection of distinct points on X. L is said to be k-jet ample on $\mathcal{Z}$ if for any r-tuple of positive integers $(k_1, \ldots, k_r)$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^r k_i = k + 1$ the map:

$$H^0(X, L) \to H^0\left(X, L \otimes (\mathcal{O}_X / (\mathfrak{m}_{x_1}^{k_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathfrak{m}_{x_r}^{k_r}))\right)$$

is surjective. L is said to be k-jet ample on X if it is k-jet ample on each such $\mathcal{Z}$ in X.

We introduce the following invariants associated to X and L; Put

$$v(L) := \min\{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}; L \text{ is not } k\text{-very ample}\} - 1,$$
$$j(L) := \min\{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}; L \text{ is not } k\text{-jet ample}\} - 1.$$

Seshadri constants have relation with generation of jets of ample line bundles in the following sense.

Lemma 5.2. *Let X be a smooth projective variety and L be an ample divisor.For any $x \in X$, put*

$$s(L,x) := \max\{s \in \mathbb{Z}; H^0(X,L) \to H^0\left(X, L \otimes (\mathcal{O}_X/\mathfrak{m}_x^{s+1})\right) \text{ is surjective}\}.$$

Then, we have the following.

1. *Let L_1, L_2 be ample divisors on X. Then,*
$$s(L_1+L_2,x) \geq s(L_1,x)+s(L_2,x),\ j(L_1+L_2) \geq j(L_1)+j(L_2).$$
2. $\epsilon(L,x) = \lim_{m\to\infty} \dfrac{s(mL,x)}{m},\ \epsilon_{\min}(L) \geq \lim_{m\to\infty} \dfrac{j(mL)}{m}.$

Proof. (1)See [5]Lemma2.2.
(2)See [12]. □

From this lemma, we have the following criterion for non k-jet ample divisors;

$$\epsilon_{\min}(L) < k \Rightarrow L \text{ is not } k\text{-jet ample}.$$

Our concern in this section is the following;

Problem 5.3. *Determine the k-very ample divisors L which are not k-jet ample on a del Pezzo surface X i.e. L such that $j(L) < v(L)$.*

We can't give a complete answer to this question. But we can give a partial answer by using Seshadri constants. Note that an ample line bundle L such that $\epsilon_{\min}(L) < v(L)$ satisfies $j(L) < v(L)$.

Let X be a blown-up $\mathbb{P}^2$ as in Section 1.1 and assume that $-K_X$ is ample. By the main result of [8], we have the following fact.

Fact 5.4. [8] *Let X be a del Pezzo surface as above and $L = \mu^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(a) - \sum_{i=1}^r b_iE_i$ be an ample line bundle on X such that L is not proportional to $-K_X$. Then*

$$v(L) = \min\left\{\alpha a - \sum_{i=1}^r \beta_i b_i; (\alpha;\beta_1,\dots,\beta_r) \in \Phi_r\right\}.$$

By this fact, we get the following result which is a partial answer to Problem 5.3.

Theorem 5.5. *Let X be a del Pezzo surface and $L = \mu^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(a) - \sum_{i=1}^r b_iE_i$ be an ample line bundle on X such that L is not proportional to $-K_X$.*

1. *Suppose $K_X^2 \geq 3$. Then $\epsilon_{\min}(L) = v(L)$.*
2. *Suppose $K_X^2 = 1, 2$. Then the following are equivalent.*
    - (a) $\epsilon_{\min}(L) = v(L)$
    - (b) $\frac{3a-\sum b_i}{2} \geq \alpha a - \sum_{i=1}^r \beta_i b_i \ \ (\forall(\alpha;\beta_1,\dots,\beta_r) \in \Phi_r)$

Proof. By Theorem 1.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_{\min}(L) &= \min\left\{\frac{\alpha a - \sum_{i=1}^r \beta_i b_i}{\beta_{r+1}}; (\alpha;\beta_1,\dots,\beta_{r+1}) \in \Phi_{r+1} \cup \Psi_{r+1} \cup \{(3;1,\dots,1,2)\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^{r+2}\right\}\\ &= \min\left\{\frac{\alpha a - \sum_{i=1}^r \beta_i b_i}{\beta_{r+1}}; (\alpha;\beta_1,\dots,\beta_{r+1}) \in \Psi_{r+1} \cup \{(3;1,\dots,1,2)\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^{r+2}\right\}\end{aligned}$$

where the term $(3;1,\dots,1,2)$ is unnecessary when $r \leq 6$.

Suppose $K_X^2 \geq 3$. Then $r \leq 6$ and $(\alpha;\beta) \in \Psi_{r+1}$ satisfies $\beta_{r+1} = 1$ and so $(\alpha;\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_r) \in \Phi_r$. Therefore $\epsilon_{\min}(L) = v(L)$ by Fact 5.4.

Suppose $r = 7$. Then $(\alpha;\beta) \in \Psi_8$ such that $\beta_8 \geq 2$ is $(3;1,\ldots,1,2) \in \mathbb{Z}^9$. Therefore

$$\epsilon_{\min}(L) = \min\left\{\min\left\{\alpha a - \sum_{i=1}^{r}\beta_i b_i ; (\alpha;\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_r) \in \Phi_r\right\}, \frac{3a - \sum_{i=1}^{r} b_i}{2}\right\}.$$

So we get the result by Fact 5.4.

Suppose $r = 8$. Note that $(\alpha;\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_9) \in \Psi_9$ such that $\beta_9 \geq 2$ satisfies that $(\alpha';\beta'_1,\ldots,\beta'_9) := (\alpha;\beta_1,\ldots,\ldots,\beta_9) - (\beta_9 - 1)(3;1,\ldots,1) = (\alpha - 3\beta_9 + 3;\beta_1 - \beta_9 + 1,\ldots,\beta_8 - \beta_9 + 1, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}^{10}$ is also contained in Ψ_9. This $(\alpha';\beta'_1,\ldots,1)$ satisfies

$$\alpha' a - \sum_{i=1}^{r}\beta'_i b_i < \frac{\alpha a - \sum_{i=1}^{r}\beta_i b_i}{\beta_{r+1}}.$$

So the terms $(\alpha;\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_9) \in \Psi_9$ such that $\beta_9 \geq 2$ are unnecessary in the equality on the top and we get

$$\epsilon_{\min}(L) = \min\left\{\min\left\{\alpha a - \sum_{i=1}^{r}\beta_i b_i ; (\alpha;\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_r) \in \Phi_r\right\}, \frac{3a - \sum_{i=1}^{r} b_i}{2}\right\}.$$

So we get the result by Fact 5.4 □

References

[1] T. Bauer, *Seshadri constants of quartic surfaces* Math. Ann. 309, 475-481 (1997).

[2] T. Bauer, *Seshadri constants on algebraic surfaces* Math. Ann., 313, 547-583, (1999).

[3] T. Bauer, C. Schulz, *Seshadri constants on the self-product of an elliptic curve*, Journal of Algebra, 320, 2981-3005, (2008).

[4] T. Bauer, T. Szemberg, *Local positivity of principally polarized abelian threefolds*, Crelle,531, 191-200.(2001).

[5] M. Beltrametti, A. Sommese, *On k-jet ampleness*, Complex analysis and geometry, 355-376, Univ. Ser. Math., Plenum, New York, 1993.

[6] A. Broustet, *Constantes de Seshadri du diviseur anticanonique des surfaces de del Pezzo*, Enseign. Math., (2) 52 no. 3-4, 231-238, (2006).

[7] J.P. Demailly, *Singular Hermitian metrics on positive line bundles*, Complex algebraic varieties (Bayreuth, 1990), 87-104, Lecture Notes in Math., 1507, Springer, Berlin, 1992.

[8] S. Di Rocco, *k-very ample line bundles on Del Pezzo surfaces*, Math.Nachr. 179, 47-56, (1996).

[9] L.F. García, *Seshadri constants on ruled surfaces: the rational and the elliptic cases*, Manuscripta Math., 119 ,no. 4, 483-505, (2006).

[10] P. Hacking, Y. Prokhorov, *Smoothable del Pezzo surfaces with quotient singularities*, to appear in Comp.Math.

[11] M. Lahyane, B.Harbourne, *Irreducibility of -1-classes on anticanonical rational surfaces and finite generation of the effective monoid*, Pacific.J.Math. vol218, No.1, 101-114 (2005).

[12] R. Lazarsfeld, *Positivity in algebraic geometry I*, Springer Verlag, 2004.

[13] M. Nakamaye, *Seshadri constants on abelian varieties* Amer. J. Math. 118 (1996), no. 3, 621-635.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, THE UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO, 3-8-1 KOMABA, MEGURO-KU, TOKYO 153-8914, JAPAN.

E-mail address: `tarosano@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp`